

defense modernization options. Missile proliferation has introduced an immediate threat to American uniformed personnel stationed abroad, and brought to the fore the prospect of ballistic missile attack on the United States as a real possibility within the next 5 to 7 years.

China, Russia, and North Korea each have well-armed missiles capable of striking parts or all of the United States, and other nations, such as Iran, may possess similar technology in the not too distant future.

This new setting has led some to call for a new strategic synthesis and a doctrinal requirement to, in the words of Michael Krepon, and I quote, "reduce the dangers from missiles and weapons of mass destruction in the uncertain period ahead."

Still, the view of the threat from abroad should not create a threat from within. An effort must be made to avoid strategic decisions that might antagonize our international competitors and/or partners, leading them to adopt a posture even more belligerent in nature. Krepon suggests, and I quote, "The net effect of missile deployments should be to reinforce reductions in nuclear forces, reassure allies, support nonproliferation partners, and reduce the salience of missiles and weapons of mass destruction."

Thus, the threat to America should be viewed holistically. It should be viewed with an eye receptive to the benefits of negotiation, diplomacy, and arms reduction possibilities, mindful of adversarial intent. The possibility of a threat does not necessarily deem it likely. Whereas missile threats to the United States and allies indeed exist and are likely to increase, other threats also remain. America, therefore, should invest in a force structure commensurate with likely threats. Above all, consideration of missile defense systems must not acquire a 21st century Maginot Line mentality.

Calls for nonpartisanship respecting an issue are generally rhetorical and strategic in nature as regards their political origin. Missile doctrine made manifest in congressional policy, however, cries out for just that approach. No other defense posture is as pregnant with controversy and potential for bitter political conflict. The costs of commitment alone set off warning bells throughout the budget spectrum. Discussion can rapidly descend into confrontation and accusation if we do not pledge to bring serious, sober consideration and resolution to the table. What is needed presently is the equivalent of a congressional deep breath.

We need to remember the various missile launch scenarios are abstract evaluations and the solutions promulgated in response are visions, for the most part, still on paper and in the mind's eye.

Missiles, offensive or defensive, are at best a technological answer to a military question, not a diplomatic answer to a question of negotiation.

International diplomacy and national policy remain an art, not a science. Science is fixed and immutable in its consequence, while art, as Andy Warhol said, is what one can get away with.

Congress must guard against allowing missile defense systems becoming the policy, allowing the technology, in effect, to develop its own psychology. There is gradually being created in the United States a burgeoning military and corporate apparatus dependent in large measure on missile defense to rationalize its existence.

It is imperative, therefore, that the Congress assess the role of missile defense policy in the overall context of national security and economic stability. The issues are real. The responsibility is ours.

MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, it is no secret that missile defense is perhaps one of the most significant national security issues facing the House this year. How our country decides to pursue reducing that specific threat affects how much we will be able to spend on other aspects of defense, how we will deal with our friends and allies, and how America participates in shaping the world.

I do not oppose missile defense. Neither do many Democrats. But I believe, as with any aspect of national security, that our expenditure should be proportional to the threat posed.

My friend, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), has laid out some very sound principles by which I believe we should proceed in considering our system, and that is a significant one.

Reducing the missile threat should be a cooperative undertaking involving the United States, nations that wish us well, and nations that do not. Every missile not built is one we do not have to defend against.

Developing our policy should also be a cooperative process, Madam Speaker. I hope the President will work with Congress in that effort. This is an area where I can assure the President that a bipartisanship is possible.

I look forward to hearing from the expert, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I also compliment the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) on his seminal work in this area. I thank him for that.

Let me speak first about the threat as it involves military intelligence. Missile defense, if nothing else, is at the terminal end of military operations. Its use represents a failure to deter, and perhaps, more to the point, a missed opportunity to have assessed accurately intentions and activity of a potential enemy.

There is no substitute, and I will repeat it, there is no substitute for comprehensive intelligence-gathering and analysis if the preventative value of missile defense is to be maximized.

Now, there are several points that should be brought out that can be termed as principles on missile defense. The deployment of missile defense systems to protect our country and its interests is a decision that should be considered in the following context.

First, missile defense investment must be measured in relation to other military requirements.

Missile defense must counter a credible threat.

Missile defense will require an integrated, fully-funded military and intelligence effort, and I will repeat, that reliability and timely intelligence is critical to the success of any missile defense system.

Missile defense must be proven to work through rigorous, realistic testing prior to any final deployment decisions. In other words, it has to work.

Missile defense must improve overall United States national security. This is fundamentally a question as to whether deploying defenses will encourage opponents to deploy counter-offenses, encouraging in the process a global missile proliferation race.

Missile defense must be deployed with an understanding that those benefiting from its protection will share in its costs. That is, if the benefits of a missile defense system are extended to share with American allies in Europe or elsewhere, equitable burden-sharing arrangements need to be made.

Finally, deployment of missile defense will be debated in relation to the provisions of the antiballistic missile defense system.

Madam Speaker, the whole issue of missile defense will be a serious issue this year. The President is making a statement regarding that later today. It is an area where bipartisanship is needed. It is an area that I feel very certain that bipartisanship will happen, but we need to be thorough and not rush to judgment and do something that is wrong or inaccurate, or something that does not work or meets the threats that are obviously apparent.

Again, let me commend our friend, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), on his efforts. I look forward to hearing our friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who has done a great deal of work in this area.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT'S MISSILE DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President's announced speech to